



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

subsequently transferred to the lower dependent organisms. The similarity is here but a superficial one, they are but similar in being dependent. Such similarity is quite of a different order from the striking and important resemblances which have enabled biologists to classify animals and plants into distinctly related families and genera. The resemblance is quite as superficial as when we speak or write of a person as "a dog," "a fox," "a shrew," or "an ass." Most persons would therefore consider that when they had called an *indolent* capitalist a "louse" or a "tape-worm," they had done more than their duty by "analogy." When, therefore, our authors gravely divide and subdivide the parasites both organic and social and pair them off together, we see that they have over-rated the value of analogy as a scientific method.

But even if the socializing biologist were to call the indolent capitalist a "louse" and go no further, he might have the tables turned upon him very readily. Were the *indolent* capitalist a louse, he would do his duty and carry on the pursuits he is fitted for, and that is just what he does not do. A louse's duty is to be a louse; he is fitted for it. A man's duty is to work and think, for he is fitted for it. You will only irritate the *indolent* capitalist by your analogy, and if he possesses any perceptive faculty you will fail to convince him. You may have a chance if you use the only true argument, namely, that he is not fulfilling his *raison d'être*.

JOHN BERRY HAYCRAFT.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE: TWO SERIES OF LECTURES.

By Sir J. R. Seeley, K.C.M.G., Litt. D., etc. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1896. Pp. xi., 387.

The late Sir John Seeley, as Professor of History at Cambridge (Eng.), made political science an important, nay, an essential part of his teaching of history. "History," according to him, "without political science has no fruit; political science without history has no root." The volume before us consists of sixteen lectures, edited from the MS. of the author by Prof. H. Sidgwick. The editor has based his text on two versions, an earlier and longer and a later but shorter course of lectures, using mainly the former. The result is a valuable addition to political science and, it may be added, to English literature. If occasionally, as might be expected in a series of lectures not specially prepared by the

author for the press, more diffuse than the "Expansion of England," with which one naturally compares it, this posthumous work has the same qualities of lucid and incisive style, while it expresses on a broader scale the author's fundamental views about the science of politics. These views, it need hardly be pointed out, are, at least as regards *method*, very different from those of Prof. Sidgwick, who professedly treats politics deductively and apart from history. With scrupulous "objectivity," the editor in his interesting preface gives no hint as to his own opinions of Prof. Seeley's theories.

By "history" Seeley means distinctively *political* history, and the facts of history he regards as the material for political science. The problem specially dealt with in these lectures is the classification of states. The inadequacy of the traditional distinctions of monarchy and republic, aristocracy and democracy, is shown by a wide range of historical illustration; and incidentally such terms as "liberty" are analyzed,—terms that constantly pass current in political discussion without examination. The "inorganic" state, where government is based solely on conquest, is distinguished from the organic state. Of the organic state three main forms are recognized,—the tribal, the theocratic, and the properly political. Among the last have to be distinguished "city-states, country-states, centralized or decentralized; federations strong or weak; states where government has a large province, states where it has a small one; states which have a government-making organ, states which have not; states where the power of government is in one hand, states where it is distributed" (p. 315). The antithesis between aristocracy and democracy is shown to be fallacious: "aristocracy proper is a principle which all states admit and in some degree practise, and democracy is no negation of aristocracy, but only of oligarchy" (p. 347). Such a slight summary can, however, give very little indication of the rich contents of the volume. The influence of Sir Henry Maine on the writer is very marked. In several respects,—*e. g.*, in the conception of the method of political science and in the recognition of the theocratic state as one of the most important forms of state,—the author reminds us of Bluntschli (who is not mentioned). Especially in regard to English constitutional history there are many suggestive and original interpretations of familiar facts. A few stray sentences may be quoted as a further indication of the problems discussed: "We should be slow to allege mere national character in explanation of

great historical phenomena" (p. 134). "There is no more conclusive way of establishing what I may call the relativeness of political truth than by advancing that even religious intolerance, which to the present age appears almost the unpardonable sin, was, in its own time and place, not absolutely condemnable. It may be called the test question upon which depends the choice between a dogmatic and a scientific view of history" (p. 137). "It seems strange that we should imagine the monarchical of all forms of government to rest on force, since evidently it is the only one of the three Aristotelian forms [the one, the few, the many] which cannot possibly do so" (p. 176). "We have been in the habit of saying that in England we do not have revolutions. * * * We have always a revolution, and therefore, in a certain sense, we never have a revolution" (pp. 194-195).

It is a pity that the book has been issued with neither an index nor even a table of contents. This seriously interferes with its utility to the student as well as to the general reader, and it is to be hoped the defect will be remedied in future editions.

DAVID G. RITCHIE.

ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE STATE. A STUDY IN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY. By Westel Woodbury Willoughby, Ph.D., Lecturer on Political Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University. New York and London: Macmillan & Co., 1896. Pp. ix., 448.

Rules of conduct may be enforceable or they may be left to the spontaneity of the individual. The one class are the characteristic mark of the state, the other of ethics proper. But the ethical student may ask, Why should force be used at all? why should not freedom, which is an integral element in any *moral* action, be universally respected? In other words, he is driven to seek some sort of a philosophy of the state; or, if he is unable to find an adequate justification for it, to reject it (at least, theoretically). It is such a philosophy which Dr. Willoughby offers to us. With the art of government, or politics in the narrower sense, he does not concern himself, but he does essay to set forth "the ultimate nature of the state and the grounds upon which its authority may be justified." His book is a painstaking and conscientious piece of work. He reveals a wide acquaintance with the history of political specula-